



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sided over by the Parson of Pancridge, or the Parson of Fanchurch.

L. 2096. *Tis salfe*: a misprint for *Tis false*. See Farmer's facsimile.

Ll. 2320-1:

To attach the murderer, he once hangd and dead,
His wealth is mine: pursue the slave thats dead.

Apparently the word *dead* at the end of the second line was caught by the typesetter from the line above. I suggest that we substitute for it the word *fled*.

L. 2547, *on my knee I begges*; so the original, but read *on my knees I begge*.

Ll. 2609-12:

Hei mihi, what shuld I say, the poison giuē I denay:
He took it perforce frō my hands, and *domine* why
not I

Got it of a gentleman, he most freely gaue it,
Aske he knew me, a means was only to haue it.

This passage seems hopelessly corrupt; ll. 2610 and 2612 seem to have been pied. The meaning of Aminadab's speech, however, is clear from other passages in the play. I have attempted to reconstruct the verse as follows:

Hei mihi what should I say,
The poison given I denay,
He took it perforce from my hand,
And *domine* why I not understand.
I got it of a gentleman,
He most freely gave it
As he knew my meaning was
Only rats to have it.

The change of *hands* to *hand* has some sanction from l. 2614, in which Young Arthur, in corroborating the statement of the schoolmaster, uses in a certain measure the same language: "Tis true, I tooke it from this man perforce, And snatcht it from his hand." The author's mind would naturally repeat the singular form. The construction "I not understand" is common with Heywood. In the last line, the addition of the word *rats* is suggested by ll. 1305-1315, and ll. 2627-8.

L. 2737. *Here lues perpetuall ioy, nere burning woe*. So in the original editions; but for *nere* read *here*.

Students of Heywood, as well as students of the Tudor-Stuart drama in general, will be grateful to Professor Swaen for placing within their reach so accurate a reprint of this fine old play, furnished with so valuable an introduction and body of notes.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

RECENT FRENCH GRAMMARS

A New French Grammar based on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology, by E. A. SONNENSCHN. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912. 211 pp.

Fundamentals of French Grammar with illustrative texts, exercises, and vocabularies, by WILLIAM B. SNOW. New York, Holt, 1912. xi + 267 pp.

Essentials of French, by VICTOR E. FRANÇOIS. New York, American Book Company, 1912. 426 pp.

It is the feeling of many teachers that the really satisfactory French grammar has not yet been written. Perhaps this accounts for the appearance almost simultaneously of three new grammars. The first comes to us from England, and we wish to say at the outset that in many ways it is excellent. Mr. Sonnenschein evidently knows his French thoroughly and, what is more, has the qualities of logic and orderliness, so that he notes for us clearly, and often with real psychological felicity, not only the most important traits, but also the minor peculiarities of French accidence and syntax. It would be pleasant to comment at length upon the results of these qualities; but there is another thing in his book which has a prior right to our attention, since it is of vital importance not merely to the success of this particular grammar but of all French grammars to be written in future. Mr. Sonnenschein was the chairman of an English committee appointed to consider "the

simplification and the unification of the terminologies and classifications employed in the grammars of the different languages."¹ This committee, representing eight different language associations, after twenty-six meetings in 1909, 1910, and 1911, has published a report in which it makes certain specific recommendations.² Will recommendations made upon such general lines prove practical when tested by the grammar of any particular language? Such is the question which must occur to many people—especially at a time when our own American committee is preparing its report. Mr. Sonnenschein's book, sticking close to the recommendations of the English committee, is above all an experiment fitted to help answer this question.

To start with, let us take two minor points. Recommendation XIII, Note 2, of the English report, reads: "The terms Article and Numeral should be used to designate not separate parts of speech but subdivisions of other parts of speech." This has led Mr. Sonnenschein to write, on page 15: "The definite article is a demonstrative adjective;" whereas on page 36 he writes: "The demonstrative adjective is *ce, cet, cette*. . ." The English report makes a distinction between an epithet and a predicate adjective, a distinction which, though of no advantage to French, Mr. Sonnenschein adopts.³ A more important point is involved in the attempt to follow the recommendation "that the terms protasis and apodosis be abandoned, and that the terms *If-clause* be used for the Clause of Condition and *Then-clause* for the Main Clause."⁴ Unfortunately, in French, among all the possible expressions used to introduce a conditional clause, the word *si* ('if') is unique and requires special rules; e. g., *si je suis, si j'avais*, as against *quand même (dans le cas où, au cas où, etc.) je serais*, and *pourvu que (en cas que, etc.) je sois*. The

Committee's term "If-clause" either must mean a clause introduced by *si* (in which case "protasis" would still be needed for other conditional clauses), or it is taken generically to include *all* conditional clauses. This last meaning, which seems to be that of the English Committee, appears illogical and misleading. Indeed it has misled Mr. Sonnenschein himself at least once. "If-clause" as used by him in § 295 can only mean a clause introduced by *si*; whereas such an interpretation in § 314 would deprive his statement of the wider application it deserves. Another recommendation of the Committee has affected the whole first part of this grammar, *viz.*: "That the names of cases" (Nom., Voc., Acc., Gen. and Dat.) "be used, so far as case-names are found to be needful, in French."⁵ Mr. Sonnenschein has found them needful quite a distance! His arrangement of the definite article gives: "Nom. and Acc., *le* or *l'*; Gen., *du* or *de l'*; Dat., *au* or *à l'*," etc., etc.⁶ He also writes out genitive and dative forms for the interrogative adjective *quel* and for the interrogative pronoun *lequel*.⁷ Why does he not continue, and do likewise for the possessive pronoun *le mien*, the demonstrative pronoun *celui*, and the demonstrative adjective *ce, cette*?⁸ And still more, if he is to be thorough, why not at least mention cases for nouns, so that the student may know how to put noun and adjective together on the analogy of *dieses Mannes* and *illius hominis*?⁹

This matter is connected, of course, with the far more important question whether it is advisable in French to teach by cases at all (with the exception, of course, of the dative of the personal pronouns). As a result of the plan

¹ *T. of G.*, Rec. XXXVI.

² § 14.

³ §§ 106, 110.

⁴ §§ 99, 101, 102.

⁵ It is unnecessary to state that we consider all this paraphernalia as hampering as it is unprofitable. That Mr. Sonnenschein himself has found it hard to handle is seen by the following: "Before words beginning with an aspirate *h* the vowel of the nominative (masc. and fem.) of the article is pronounced and written" (§ 16). What about the vowel of the *accusative*?

¹ The Committee's report, p. 3; see *infra*, n. 2.

² *On the Terminology of Grammar, being the Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology*. London, John Murray, 1911.

³ *T. of G.*, Recommendation III; Sonnenschein, § 256.

⁴ *T. of G.*, Rec. XII, note 1.

adopted in this grammar, the prepositions *de* and *à* seem little more than mere case signs, like the *-i* and *-o* of the Latin second declension. And yet even though this cumbersome repetition of the so-called genitive and dative cases were carried out consistently throughout the paradigms, it would fail to cover the ground. Mr. Sonnenschein himself has found it advisable to supplement it. In treating the relatives, instead of writing "Gen., *de qui*; Dat., *à qui*," he has designated this *qui* as a "Special form after a preposition."¹⁰ It might be well to apply this method still further and to replace case-forms by just this designation when explaining the relatives *lequel*¹¹ and *quoi*,¹² and the interrogative pronouns *qui* and *quoi*.¹³ In the first place, they are, before all else, the forms to be used as the objects of *all* prepositions and not merely of *de* and *à*; and, in the second place, we are not sure that, after all, for English speaking pupils, there is a real advantage in identifying the special combinations of *de* and *à* plus a noun with the genitive and dative cases of more highly inflected languages. The uses of such combinations do not coincide with the use of real genitives and real datives with sufficient regularity to warrant a very close association of the two. Not to go beyond the facts brought out by this very grammar, we note that *à*-phrases are often used when, within the French language itself, they could not be replaced by a dative pronoun;¹⁴ and Mr. Sonnenschein himself notes that six out of the thirteen adverbial uses of the *de*-clauses correspond to the Latin uses of the ablative, not of the genitive.¹⁵ This being the case, is it not more practical to call the combinations *de* + noun and *à* + noun what they really are, i. e., "*de*-phrases" and "*à*-phrases,"

and then, if we like, compare the uses of these phrases with the genitives and the datives of Latin, rather than to put upon a French construction a Latin name which does not fit it exactly? In the end, if we wish to understand the real subtleties of French we shall have to study *de* and *à*, like *en*, *sans*, etc., as prepositions having uses all their own.¹⁶

The English Committee's desire to unify and harmonize has led to the abolition of certain form-groups and their names, among them some which are of great assistance in teaching French grammar. One of these is the partitive article. In connection with the declension of the indefinite article, the pupil is told that 'boys' is *des garçons* (Nom. and Acc.), *de garçons* (Gen.), and *à des garçons* (Dat.).¹⁷ Beyond this, he gets no explanation of partitive forms until he meets them again under "genitive phrases" in the Syntax (Part II of the book).¹⁸ Similarly, no recognition was given by the English Committee to the distinction between such forms as *me* and *moi*.¹⁹ Such characteristic features of French grammar must be emphasized if we are to present the peculiarities of the language with the definiteness necessary for successful teaching.

In treating the verbs, certain changes were made in the nomenclature of the tenses. The most important of these changes is the adoption of the names "Future in the Past" and "Future Perfect in the Past," for the Conditional and the Conditional Past respectively.²⁰ Perhaps the most interesting section of Mr. Sonnenschein's book is that in which he picks out modern usages showing traces of the original meanings of these tenses.²¹ It seems to us, however, that neither Mr. Sonnenschein nor the English Committee has taken sufficiently into account the change that the meaning of the

¹⁰ § 117. The reason for this was, we suppose, the existence of the form *dont*. Strictly speaking, however, this *dont* is no more a real genitive than is the phrase *de qui*.

¹¹ § 118; referring to things, as distinguished from *qui* referring to persons.

¹² § 119.

¹³ § 108.

¹⁴ §§ 394-403.

¹⁵ Page 153, note 3.

¹⁶ We cannot find any mention of *de* + adjective, as used in expressions like *quelque chose de bon*.

¹⁷ § 19.

¹⁸ § 414.

¹⁹ Six out of twenty-four members of the Committee, however, expressed their formal regret at this omission; see *T. of G.*, Addendum, p. 40.

²⁰ *T. of G. Rec.* XL, XLIII, note 2.

²¹ § 310.

Conditional has undergone in reaching its most modern signification.²² "It denotes what is likely to happen, subject to certain conditions of the present or future," says Mr. Sonnenschein and he calls this modern meaning "conditioned futurity."²³ Does this cover entirely such a sentence as "If he were here, I should be glad, *S'il était ici, je serais content*" ? Is this not rather a conditioned *present*?²⁴

As may readily be seen from the above, the criticism which we would make of the grammar is this: it distorts the modern language. It encumbers French with barren distinctions (the cases; "epithet" versus "predicate adjective," etc.), and by stressing historical grammar and using Latin as more or less of a guide, it does not lay sufficient emphasis upon the essential and characteristic traits of the language as it stands to-day (no methodical recognition of pronoun forms to be used after prepositions other than *de* and *à*; the "present" value of the conditional; the distinction between the disjunctive and the conjunctive pronouns; the partitive article). Yet in spite of this, *A New French Grammar* leaves with us the impression of being a good book.²⁵ Whether its merits are due to the influence of the English Committee or, as we believe, to Mr. Sonnenschein's own personal knowledge of French and French grammar, it is certainly to be recommended. Unfortunately, being divided sharply into Accidence and Syntax, having no exercises, and aiming rather to record facts than to present its material in a form readily learned by young pupils, it can be of little use in our schools.

²² "A remote possibility as to what may happen in the future regarded from the present standpoint" says the *T. of G.*, § XLIII, note 2.

²³ § 312.

²⁴ Compare "conditional possibility," the term used by Clédât; see *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Lyon*, Vol. 1, pp. 77-86.

²⁵ We have noted a few surprising omissions; e. g., that of *ce* in the diagram of the demonstrative pronoun (§ 102). Even § 104 has only *ceci* and *cela*, with no example of *ce* alone, as in *c'est, ce qui*, etc. After § 350, there should come another paragraph giving such uses of the subjunctive as *Voilà un plaisir que peu de personnes eussent goûté*; cf. § 317.

The *Fundamentals of French Grammar* is primarily destined for school use. Any book by so experienced and successful a teacher as Mr. Snow must compel the attention of his brother teachers. The volume before us is particularly interesting in that it attacks its subject from an original standpoint. Mr. Snow believes that "one should never do for the pupil what the latter can profitably do for himself."¹ Accordingly, throughout the first part of the book, each new topic is headed by a set of illustrative sentences which it is the purpose of the subsequent remarks to clarify and explain. Care is at all times taken not to explain more than is absolutely necessary, the student being required to do some of the work himself. In the section dealing with the feminine of adjectives, for instance, no feminine forms are given (except in the illustrative sentences); the student is merely supplied with masculine forms which he is asked to put into the feminine according to a given rule. The complete tenses of verbs are never written out; the student is taught the necessary rules and writes out the tense himself from the principal parts of the verb in question. Mr. Snow further believes that "irregular forms should be attacked early . . . while one form is as easy to memorize as another."² Thus, for instance, the very first lesson on verbs includes a striking variety (*donner, prendre, savoir, dire*, etc.³) and, as it is part of his system to teach by tenses and not by conjugations, the pupil is immediately told how to form the singular of the present indicative of all these verbs.

It is pleasing to note throughout this book the author's evident desire to present each subject in a form suggested by his own class-room experience. Nevertheless, considering the book as a whole, we must mention certain unfortunate features which are, in a measure, the defects of its merits. The effort to stimulate the pupil's observation and at the same time to explain what he may have noticed, is apt to lead to roundabout processes of either state-

¹ P. iv.

² P. iv.

³ P. 23, § 38.

ment or reasoning.⁴ At times, too, Mr. Snow seems to give the pupil hardly enough guidance;⁵ while at others—especially when no example is given—it is hard even for the experienced teacher to understand the application of an explanation.⁶ The originality of the method of presentation is responsible also, no doubt, for a certain lack of arrangement. The fullest treatment of the adjectives, for instance, is found under nouns,⁷ where, as a result of this association, the unwary student might easily infer that he had a right to coin a feminine noun from any masculine noun according to the rules applying to adjectives; e. g., *servitrice* from *serviteur* and *canarde* from *canard*! Intending to be brief,⁸ why should Mr. Snow introduce the accident used by seventeenth century writers?⁹ And why, especially, introduce into the text itself the name of Paul Passy, accompanied by a footnote at the bottom of the page?¹⁰ Equally disconcerting is the way in which the most elementary explanations¹¹ rub elbows with technical terms such as “uvular,” “atonic,” “substantive concept,” and “periphrastic form.”¹²

Turning now to matters of detail, we mention a few of the points that have arrested our attention. It seems to us a mistake, when speaking of the omission of the article in participles, to discard the usual division devoted to negatives; Mr. Snow includes *je ne mange jamais de grenouilles* under the heading “Participles introduced by the prepositions *sans* or *de*.”¹³ But how is the unaided student to associate the *de* with the negative? Under the heading “*Ce* and *Il* as Subject,”¹⁴ we would suggest that such sentences as *ce sera à faire*

demain and *ce n'est pas plus difficile que ça* be connected with *c'est un étai* and *savoir, c'est pouvoir*, and not, as they are by Mr. Snow, with *il est facile de faire cela*. The fact seems to be that the French *ce*, being not so vigorously demonstrative as the English ‘this’ or ‘that,’ has a wider application and is used to designate whatever one cannot or does not care to identify with a noun having a definite gender and number. Having once established this idea of the demonstrative, our rules are easily given: (1) If English ‘it’ is such a demonstrative, always use *ce*¹⁵, and (2) If the pronoun is not demonstrative, use the inflected *il* whenever *être* is followed by a predicate adjective, otherwise use *ce*.¹⁶ In the treatment of the verbs there is a very unfortunate juxtaposition. “Dropping the vowel of the infinitive ending,” says Mr. Snow, “sometimes brings together consonants that do not blend well, such as two liquids (l, n, r) and this requires further changes in the stem,” a statement followed almost immediately by such forms as *aller, irai; être, serai; and faire, ferai!*¹⁷ The appearance now of *y*, now of *i*, in the various forms of *croire, employer, asseoir*, etc., Mr. Snow explains under the heading of “Orthographic Conventions,” and he says: “Certain verbs use the letter *y* before a pronounced vowel and *i* before mute *e* or a consonant.”¹⁸ This can hardly be an “orthographic” convention, since Mr. Snow’s own phonetic transcription shows a different pronunciation for *y* and *i* in *employons* and *emploient*. More than this, it is well to remember that where two spellings are allowed, e. g., *paye* and *paie*, two pronunciations certainly exist in modern speech.¹⁹

⁴ E. g., p. 28, § 46; p. 96, § 136.

⁵ E. g., p. 131, § 200; the first sentence set for the pupil to change.

⁶ E. g., p. 46, § 68; the first sentence of the explanation.

⁷ P. 91, § 128.

⁸ See p. iii, second sentence.

⁹ P. 119, § 170.

¹⁰ P. 65, § 97.

¹¹ E. g., p. 13, § 20.

¹² Pp. 28, 96, 56.

¹³ P. 21, § 36, 2.

¹⁴ P. 107, § 147.

¹⁵ It would be well to note that the rules here given apply solely to *il* and *ce* as subjects of *être* and even then only provided *être* has its ordinary meaning. When *être* indicates time or position, for instance, they do not obtain.

¹⁶ The exceptions are the same as those given by Mr. Snow.

¹⁷ P. 69, § 99. These forms cannot of course be considered as examples of the preceding statement.

¹⁸ P. 29, § 47.

¹⁹ However close the connection, if any, may be between the written and the spoken forms.

In summing up, we would say that this book is an interesting experiment. It evidently has as a foundation a collection of helpful notes prepared for class-room use. Whether or not the author has been able to construct upon this foundation a new system of grammar which teachers in general will find satisfactory, we are unable to say. The only fair test for a volume written along these lines is a year's use in the class-room.²⁰

Our third grammar, *Essentials of French*, is also fitted primarily for school-room use rather than for reference. In general Mr. François's manner of exposition is this: he heads each paragraph with a number of illustrative sentences, stating immediately below these the point he wishes to make; thereupon follows a vocabulary (with ample repetition from one lesson to the next); and finally come exercises in translation from French into English and from English into French with the occasional addition of an interesting reading lesson. The novelty of the book—as far as it is a novelty—lies in the application of the principle that “on n'apprend bien une langue qu'en la comparant à une autre déjà connue.”¹ This leads at times to an interesting way of putting things, such as, for instance, on p. 248: “*He*

is, she is, . . . are translated by *il est, elle est*, when answering the questions . . . *What is his, her, profession, business, nationality, etc.,*” whereas “*He is, she is . . .* are translated by *c'est . . .* when answering the question . . . *Who is he or she?*”² or such as the statement on p. 165: “Notice . . . that *plusieurs* is not followed by *de* except when *of* is expressed in English.”

Taken as a whole, this *Essentials of French* is a careful and accurate piece of work. It will not do at all for those who believe in mastering the various divisions of elementary grammar one at a time. This is not its aim. By those, on the other hand, who wish to give their pupils parts of various subjects in each lesson and to keep many threads going simultaneously, it will no doubt be found very satisfactory. Indeed it is remarkably free from the obscurities and slips which this somewhat scrappy method of treatment encourages. We have, however, noted a few. Given without further explanation,³ it is hard to get the meaning of two such statements as: “*Pas* is usually omitted in subjunctive clauses when the main clause is negative or impliedly so”⁴ (What about *vous n'êtes pas content que nous ne soyons pas en retard?*), and: “The preposition *à* is expressed in French and followed by the stressed or disjunctive personal pronoun object . . . whenever the personal pronouns *me, te, nous, vous, se* are direct objects.”⁵ In § 672, there appears not obscurity, but what we are tempted to call an error. Mr. François states that “if the noun is represented by *en*” (as in the second part of *Ces fleurs sont jolies: il y en a de blanches, de rouges, et de jaunes*), “*de* alone and not *des* is used.” This rule is not, we think, generally followed in France. In the treatment of

*For the benefit of those desiring to make this test, we add the following suggestions and corrections:

Page 10, “petiole” is in English pronounced as written, not with *ti=*s or *sh*, as the statement would perhaps suggest.—Page 7, cross out the sentence about the tilde; otherwise the student will take it for a regular sign of French orthography.—P. 12, the phonetic alphabet should be so placed as to be helped by the French sounds explained on p. 30.—Page 41, the answers to the exercises appear by mistake at the foot of the page in the transcription.—Page 126, *hier, là, tôt* should receive special mention; to the beginner they seem quite as “short, common and unstressed” as *trop* and to be entitled to occupy the same position.—In general, though perhaps contrary to the general plan of the work, the insertion of cross references and the translation of French sentences quoted as examples would, in our estimation, greatly add to the usefulness of this book.

¹See the title page; also the preface, p. 3.

²Mr. François adds here “or when the predicate is modified by an adjective of quality.”

³The pupil can hardly be expected to use the illustrative sentences for anything more than confirmation of the statements made below them.

⁴§ 620.

⁵§ 584. We need some indication that this rule refers to the use of *two* pronouns with the same verb, otherwise the pupil might write *Il voit à nous=* He sees us.

verbs, we should suggest, as a help in teaching the irregularities of verbs like *acquerir*, *mourir*, *valoir*, etc., the use of seven principal parts, *i. e.*, the addition of the Future and the Pres. Subjunctive. In general, throughout the book, we should suggest that when giving the first simple rules which are to be modified in later lessons, Mr. François should more frequently prepare the pupil for such subsequent modifications. With the average pupil a first impression is very tenacious. Having learned in § 501 that a repeated conjunction is replaced by *que* "followed by the tense and the mood required by the first conjunction," he may find it difficult to remember the rule given in § 520 to the effect that "*que* replacing the conjunction *si*, is followed by the subjunctive."

No notice of this trustworthy grammar would be complete without mention of the appendix, where may be found tabulated in fairly convenient form those paradigms of which the *disjecta membra* are to be found in the preceding pages.

A. G. H. SPIERS.

Haverford College.

Consuelo, comedia en tres actos y en verso, por ADELARDO LÓPEZ DE AYALA. Edited with introduction and notes by AURELIO M. ESPINOSA. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1911. 16mo., x + 212 pp.

No other of Ayala's plays has, to my knowledge, received editing for the use of American students. In his preface, Professor Espinosa indicates that the present volume is destined "for use in the advanced Spanish classes of the colleges and universities of the United States." Ayala's position in the last century is that of a dramatic poet whose work aided largely the reestablishment of correct theatrical taste in Spain, who defined and established rules of dramatic art in conformity with the modern spirit, and who reconciled warring schools and tendencies. While the difficulties of the author's style are not unusually great, the general excellence of his work, and of the present play

in particular, from the view-point of artistic literary workmanship, and the remarkable adaptability of its plot to logical analysis, make the text chosen a singularly happy one for classes whose members may be supposed to be, at least to some extent, students of literature as such. Pupils of this grade will have the added advantage of being able to study the play in the light of the author's own analysis of its plot and characters,—a fact worthy of more attention than the mere mention in the editor's preface. Finally, the introductory material includes a list of the principal sources of biographical and critical material.

The introduction, which aims at suggestiveness rather than completeness, acquaints the student with the essential facts in the author's life and with his position in literary history. I note, however, a few errors of detail. There is no play of Ayala's entitled *La Primita y el luto*; *La primita y el tutor* is no doubt intended. The author's university career at Seville was limited to a year or so and he could hardly have finished the course. It is not made clear that *Los dos Guzmanes* and the play of the same name mentioned on the following page are the same early effort, written in 1843 at the age of sixteen and played for the first time March 20, 1851. *Castigo y perdón* (the definite articles do not appear on the title page) was first produced November 21, 1851. Ayala was president of the lower house of the Spanish Cortes, the Congreso de los Diputados, not of the Cortes itself.

The editor follows Fitzmaurice-Kelly (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. s. v. Ayala) and Blanco García (p. 175) in giving the date of Ayala's death as January 30, 1879. P.A. de Alarcón (Preface to vol. VII of the *Obras*, p. 8), and J. O. Picón (*Autores dramáticos contemporáneos*, vol. II, p. 398), as well as the writer of the article in Montaner y Simón's *Diccionario enciclopédico*, give December 30 of the same year (1879). Alarcón and Picón were writing but a few years after the death of the dramatist and must have known him well. Conclusive evidence is furnished, however, by the Madrid dispatch to the London *Times* of December 31, 1879. This dispatch, dated De-